



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,461	11/07/2008	Fedor Maas	P18140-US1	6927
27045	7590	06/22/2011		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER HONG, HARRY S	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/22/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/596,461

Applicant(s)

MAAS, FEDOR

Examiner

HARRY HONG

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 32 fails to recite the parent claim number.

Claims 33 and 34 depend on claim 32. However, claim 33 also fails to recite the reference claim number.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 11, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pelletier et al. (Pelletier; US 6,411,704 B1; cited by the applicant and applied for the first time in the present application).

Regarding claim 1, Pelletier discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a method for providing a value added service, such as an intelligent network service (cf. col. 1, lines 6-9), which is available in a first network (cf. the PSTN 36 in Fig. 4), to a subscriber (cf. CPE 22) in a second network (cf. the PSTN 23), in which the first network (cf. the PSTN 36) comprises a first network node (cf. the Service Node (SN) 40) for executing the value added service (cf. the SN 40

provides advances telephony services such as call forwarding, caller ID, voice-mail, etc, see col. 3, lines 35-40), comprising:

- detecting in a terminating call to the subscriber (cf. the called party B at the CPE 22) that the subscriber desires to use the value added service (cf. step 102 in Fig. 5; said call forwarding, caller ID, voice-mail, etc. are terminating services);
- forwarding control of the call towards the first network node (cf. the entire call, i.e. voice and control, is forwarded to the Service Node 40) associated with a forwarding number in the first network (cf. steps 110-118 in figures 5 and 6; col. 3, line 53 - col. 4, line 3);
- executing the value added service by the first network node (cf. the SN 40), and, when necessary, further directing the call towards the subscriber (cf. the called party B at CPE 22) in the second network (cf. the PSTN 23) associated with the terminating call (cf. steps 120-124 in Fig. 6; col. 4, lines 3-24).

Claim 11 defines a similar method for providing an originating service. Pelletier however, also teaches how to provide an originating service (cf. col. 3, line 53-67: "If, however, caller A is a subscriber to one or more of the telephone services...").

Claims 19 and 20 each define an exchange in the second network, containing essentially the same subject-matter as claims 1 and 11, respectively; (the claimed exchanges correspond to the CO 25 and CO 24 of Pelletier, respectively).

Claims 23 and 24 each define an indexing register associated with the service node, in the context of providing a terminating service and an originating service, respectively. The presence of such an indexing register is implicitly disclosed and considered inherent in Pelletier (cf. col. 4, lines 3-7).

Claim 29 defines the service node for executing the value added service, which corresponds to the service node 40 of Pelletier.

Claim 32 defines a communication system, yet does not appear to contain any additional features with respect to claim 19 or with respect to claim 20 as rejected above. The similar rejection therefore applies.

Claim 33 defines a communication system, yet does not appear to contain any additional features with respect to claim 23 or with respect to claim 24 as rejected above. The similar rejection therefore applies.

Claim 34 defines a communication system, yet does not appear to contain any additional features with respect to claim 29 as rejected above. The similar rejection therefore applies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 2-10, 12-18, 21, 22, 25-28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelletier as applied above.

Dependent claims 2-10, 12-18, 21, 22, 25-28, 30, and 31 do not contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, rise to a level of patentability since these additional features concern obvious design choices and/or are suggested by Pelletier.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HARRY HONG whose telephone number is (571)272-7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harry S. Hong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

June 16, 2011